DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 138 08 VT 012 530

AUTHOR Hall, Jeanette
TITLE Pilot "C" Curriculum Evaluation and Interpretive Analysis. Phase II Final Report.
INSTITUTION YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO BR-7-0329
PUB DATE 30 Sep 70
GRANT OEG-0-8-070329-3694(085)
NOTE 44p.; Social Service Aide Project for the Training and Education of Paraprofessionals

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Associate Degrees, Career Planning, Community Colleges, *Core Curriculum, *Credit Courses, *Curriculum Evaluation, General Education, Interdisciplinary Approach, Manpower Development, Post Secondary Education, *Social Services, Student Seminars, *Subprofessionals

ABSTRACT

The 20-25 participants of Pilot C of Phase II of the Social Service Aide Project, a program of exemplary education for the career development of paraprofessionals in social and/or human services, were selected to attend an 8-week seminar at Central YMCA College, Chicago, which stressed an interdisciplinary approach to introductory college-level work and provided 3 hours credit each (total of 12 hours credit) for Communications (English 101), Introduction to Psychology (Psychology 201), Group Process (Philosophy 101), and Techniques of Organization and Decision Making (Psychology 150). Evaluation was accomplished by three questionnaires administered to the participants, and evaluative comments by staff and students are included in the report. An interpretive analysis section compares the YMCA's former and present employee classification plan to that of the human services career ladder developed by Career Options, which is available as VT 012 533. Phase I of this project is available as ED 032 062 (RIE, May 1970), and related documents are available as VT 012 531-012 533, and VT 012 535 in this issue. (SB)

ED047138

BR 7-0329
PA 08
VT

Phase II Final Report

PILOT "C" CURRICULUM
EVALUATION AND INTERPRETIVE ANALYSIS

Project No. 7-0329
Grant No. OEG-0-8-0-70329-3694 (085)
SOCIAL SERVICE AIDE PROJECT
For the Training and Education of
Paraprofessionals

September 30, 1970

Career Options Research and Development
-A Special Project of
the Young Men's Christian Association
19 South La Salle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60603

This project is supported by the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Research, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under Section 4 (c) of the Vocational Education Act, 1963. Points of view or opinions do not, however, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education
Bureau of Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

VT012530

Phase II Final Report

PILOT "C" EVALUATION

Prepared by Jeanette Hall

Project No. 7-0329
Grant No. OEG-0-8-070329-3694(085)
SOCIAL SERVICE AIDE PROJECT
For the Training and Education
of Paraprofessionals

September 30, 1970

Career Options Research and Development
-A Special Project of
the Young Men's Christian Association
19 South La Salle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60603

This project is supported by the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Research, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under Section 4 (c) of the Vocational Education Act, 1963. Points of view or opinions do not, however, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education
Bureau of Research

Background

About Phase I of SSAP:

During Phase I of SSAP four Chicago area community colleges (Kennedy - King, Chicago City College; Central YMCA Community College; and Thornton Community College), cooperatively developed a career oriented curriculum in the human service field. It was intended to be a career development program that would secure entry positions with realistic career ladders in the field of human services.

About Pilot "C"

In an attempt to demonstrate and evaluate a human service core curriculum, as researched and proposed in Phase I of the Social Service Aide Project, Career Options developed Pilot "C". It provided a budget of $5,000 for a test period of eight weeks in July and August, 1970.

The YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago agreed to provide the study population on released-time. The idea simply, was to utilize 1) The YMCA-NTL Network to establish a channel through which community Professionals could be certified as YMCA Professionals in human services, e.g. group work, street work, counseling, etc. 2) The YMCA Community College to establish a system of accreditation of the courses utilized from the core curriculum.

A meeting was held with the YMCA-NTL Coordinating Committee (an affiliate of the National Training Laboratory of National Education Association) to present the proposal and seek their approval and cooperation in its further development and implementation. Subsequently a task force was formed to work with Career Options. Task Force members represented a cross section of YMCA Personnel: John Bouseman, Dean, YMCA Community College; Levertt King, Director, South Shore YMCA and Chairman of YMCA-NTL Coordinating Committee; Henry Blackwell, Jobs Now Project; Ruth Gallinot, YMCA Community College; and Wardell Haywood, Vice-President, YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago. A total of six meetings were held with the task force before the date of June 29th was set for the implementation of Pilot "C". (This date coincided with the YMCA Community College's summer schedule.)

During the course of these meetings the Task Force worked to develop and refine the following areas for Pilot "C":

1. Spell out the method of training;
2. Develop a grading and assessment system for participants;
3. Identify more specifically the areas of responsibility for the YMCA-NTL Network and the YMCA Community College as they related to the actual training, certification and accreditation;

4. Documented evidence of need through profiles;
5. Set up meeting with John Casey, YMCA Personnel & Staff Development office - inviting him to join in future Task Force meetings;
6. Specify course responsibilities with regard to outlines (syllabi);
7. Identify outside resources.

Due to the limitations in time and budget the Task Force agreed that the best course would be to select participants from the Near South District. (That district had cooperated during Phase I by allowing SSAP staff to conduct job task analysis in their Centers).

A special meeting was requested with William Wethers, Near South District Director; Charles Curry, Executive Director of Youth Action; Theadore Evans, Executive Director Auburn YMCA; Effie Peters, Executive Director Chatham YMCA; and Levertt King, Executive Director South Shore YMCA. At that meeting the refined Pilot "C" concept paper was presented. We found the Near South District administrative personnel were willing to cooperate with our staff. They agreed to supply 20-25 people on released time to participate in the pilot project.

With the help of John Bouseman, CORD Staff were introduced to Dr. J.P. Dave department head and instructor at the college. Dr. Dave suggested that we look at the recently developed Quest Seminar at the college as a format to be used in Pilot "C". It was our belief that the Seminar method was in fact a prime example of "exemplary education".

The last steps to be taken for the implementation of the pilot project were two meetings with the Seminar staff, for the planning and designing of the eight week seminar. Included in these meetings was a trainer from the YMCA-NTL Network. As a result of those meetings the schedule was:

WEEK I

During the first week of the seminar, we attempted to accomplish several important goals;

1) orientation to the concerns and methods of the seminar;
2) opening ourselves up to each other in initial contacts;
3) introduction of human relations as a basic concern and method;
4) development of a sense of what we want to put into and get out of the seminar as individuals and as groups;
5) completion of necessary paperwork.

A key component of these first four sessions was the use of techniques developed in connection with human relations laboratories.

General Format for the Remainder of the Seminar

The normal weekly schedule for the seminar was alternated between two different kinds of processes:

1) CORE GROUPS (Tuesday and Thursday)

These sessions broaden the human relations direction of the first week. We discussed a variety of materials and developed other activities to illuminate the issues of personal growth, identity, and community.

2) WORKSHOPS (Monday and Wednesday)

On these days, the resources of the two core groups were combined. The uses included:

a) regularly scheduled workshops in each of the disciplines of the seminar;
b) student-initiated workshops;
c) individual contacts on projects between instructors and students and working sessions among students;
d) unencumbered conversation.

The workshop schedule was posted each Monday morning. Anyone who wanted to initiate workshops, bring in speakers, show movies, play games, etc., they could add their event to the schedule, requesting staff help if desired or needed.

Addendum: Staff meetings were held on Thursday afternoons, after the seminar session. If students had any concerns that they felt the staff should deal with, they felt free to join.

Weekend Sessions

Weekend sessions were not scheduled in advance of the start of the Seminar. Instructors felt that the process was extremely useful only when used at the right time. Students were told to anticipate devoting at least one weekend to the Seminar.

From the core curriculum we selected four courses to be tested: Communications, Introduction to Psychology, Group Process, and Techniques of Organization and Decision Making. Participants received three credit hours for each course making a total of twelve credit hours for the Seminar. The courses appeared on each transcript as: English 101, Psychology 201, Philosophy 101, and Psychology 150.

About the Seminar

The Seminar was an interdisciplinary approach to introductory college-level work that was relevant to the needs of mature students who missed college or in some cases high school. It was held in the Central YMCA College, located on the edge of Chicago's Loop.

In the Seminar, self-discovery was the goal; the disciplines were merely tools in the process. Self, your relation to others, psychological, cultural, and ideological situations, were the real subject matter of the Seminar.

"How do you grade an individual's personal growth and self discovery?" That was the question facing the instructors. It was their belief that there is no way to grade those factors. Yet, it would be irresponsible to send students into further academic experiences without the rudimentary knowledge implied on their transcripts.

Therefore minimal requirements were established: selected readings, papers, research projects, etc., for each of the four courses. If these requirements were unmet, the students received an incomplete; if they were met, they negotiated the grade with the instructor involved in a particular course. This was felt to be a variant on the pass-fail system.

Course Requirements

Requirements for Psychology 201 (Introduction to Psychology)

In the seminar Psychology 201 is not traditionally taught both content-wise and methodwise. Those who wanted to cover the traditional course content could do it by going through any standard general psychology textbook (Munn, Morgan, Hillgard, Hebb, and Lindgren to name a few well-known textbook authors). The staff ordered two basic textbooks that could be bought at Economy Book Store (171 West Madison). Those books were:

1. Human Behavior: A Program for Self-Instruction edited by Malpass and others. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1965, paperback.
2. Psychology and Life by Floyd Ruch. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman.

If students wanted to cover the traditional course content, it was their responsibility to go through the textbooks. Students were encouraged to share their knowledge with others. They were encouraged to get any help they needed from instructors.

The book that was required for everyone to purchase and study was Encounter: Issues of Human Concern edited by Robert Gutherie. Menlo Park, California; Cummings Publishing Co. Inc. 1970, paperback. It was used as a core book.

In addition to this core book, each student was required to work on a special project in psychology which ranged from reading and discussing a book to doing some in-class and out-of-class research work. They could deal with a particular topic in depth (love, anxiety, sex, drugs, alienation, freedom, creativity to name a few) or study one psychologist in depth (Freud, Fromm, Rogers, Maslow, Skinner to name some) or to interpret a book from a psychological point of view (The Stranger, Siddharthe, Giovanni's Room, Gandhi's Autobiography to name some) to do some research (documentary or empirical). Instructors requested a written proposal as to what each student was going to do for the special project (deadline: before the end of the third week).

Students were asked to meet with instructors individually or in groups during the second and third week to share their ideas for the special project.

English 101 Requirements

A short conference was held with each student during the first two weeks of the seminar to discuss their strengths and weaknesses in writing and to devise a plan of work in writing during the semester. The material for this discussion was a writing sample done during the first week of class plus any other material the student would like to bring in.

If a student already wrote as well as he needed, the projects for psychology and philosophy plus relevant parts of the journal fulfilled their writing requirements.

Minimal Requirements for Philosophy 101

The one requirement was for students to come to grip philosophical issues centering on one of the following terms or categories:

Freedom
Identity
God
Love
Ecology and whole system
Knowledge
Human Nature
Community
Morality

In order to do this cooperatively and easily, they followed this schedule:

1. On Wednesday of the 2nd week (July 8), they turned in a paper giving the terms they wanted to work on with reasons for selecting that particular term. These were returned with suggested readings on them.

2. On Wednesday of the 4th week (July 22nd) students turned in a paper telling what problems, if any, they were having with a topic, and what issues they wanted to follow up on. These were returned with suggestions for answering these questions.

3. On Wednesday of the 6th week (August 5th), students turned in an outline or draft of the topic.

4. The final version of the philosophical experiment was turned in on August 20th.

The only criterion for this paper was the use of philosophical tools to get at the topic and thus show understanding of what philosophy is good for; norms and specific content were open.

The instructor was available for individual discussion on these projects on workshop days.

Minimal Requirements for Psychology 150 (Human Relations)

1. The success of the seminar as a whole, and especially of the human relations component, depended on the attendance and participation of all members of the groups. In order to achieve this, students were asked that they be at every session unless insuperable problems kept them away; and that they attempt to contribute to what was going on in whatever way possible.

2. Every participant in the seminar (instructors included) kept an on-going record of what was happening in the seminar and of their feelings and reflections about these events. There was no strict form that the journal should take.

The total process was open to as much involvement by students as the students were willing to accept. The seminar depended on the students. They had to choose to learn for the work to be successful. It was education by communication and confrontation, action as well as reflection.

Methods:

Both traditional and innovative classroom methods were utilized. The four-day schedule alternated between workshops and "core groups". In workshops, students worked individually, in groups, with or without an instructor. Sometimes the workshops were used for individual conferences on a specific topic or area of concern. Some students used their workshops for conducting research. It was not unusual to see two students discussing a topic over a tape recorder microphone. The workshop was also used for presentation by instructors; this generally led to a group discussion.

Core groups were less traditionally oriented. Emphasis was placed on human relations techniques. These ranged from theoretical inputs and process observations by instructors to sensitivity groups.

During the first week of classes, the group members were introduced to these techniques and at the same time began to build the community it was hoped they would become.

Several small groups of students set about the task of forming "Seminar Goals":

Seminar Goals:

Broadening the limits of what we can give and receive both in relation to ourselves and in relation to others: becoming more open;

Experimenting with the kind of community we would like to live in and developing a philosophy of life which expresses this;

Relating internal relationships to external (outside world) relationships: both ways. Specifically understanding the psychology of power structures that are imposed upon us and developing ways of dealing

constructively and/or destructively with it.

One intensive 24-hour marathon was held, the aim was to further develop the sense and feeling of community. Some of the human relations techniques aimed at personal and interpersonal growth. Others were more task oriented and concerened with topics such as group decision making and problem solving. Both verbal and non-verbal techniques were used.

At the beginning of the seminar, everyone was asked to keep a journal to record both classroom events and perceptions and feelings about those events. This was useful for sharpening writing skills.

Another technique utilized was role-playing, with both student-and instructor -selected reading material. "The Zoo Story" by Edward Albee provided discussion of psychological and idealogical points of view through student interaction within the play's characters.

Seminar Staff Evaluation

Before beginning the Seminar Staff's evaluation, presented here are three autobiographies given to the students the first day. The evaluation by staff are excerpts from tape recordings.

Namaste! (greetings)

I am Jagdish Premshander Dave or J.P., your psychology instructor.

I am a product of at least two cultures - Indian and American, primarily Indian, secondarily American.

I like to be with people. I am deeply interested in exploring, discovering and appreciating behaviors and experiences from a humanistic point of view. I am greatly interested in relating myself to others and sharing mutual experiences.

In the seminar, I represent the discipline of psychology. I will function as a resource person for Psychology 201 (Introduction to Psychology). I would like to probe and peruse individually and in groups some of our basic concerns that are integral parts of our growth and development.

I love music, philosophy, literature, and nature. I enjoy singing. Meditation is another thing close to my heart. I would like to conduct meditation sessions for the seminar community.

What does bother me? Lack of concern for others, lack of personal commitment, phoniness (and at times American English as a foreign language!).

Summer 1970

Autobiography - Diane Franklin

Biographical trivia

Born in Cambridge, Mass. in 1945. Lived in Boston until 1966, then came to Chicago where I've lived since. Got a B.A. in Social Relations from Radcliff College in 1966 and have been a student in Psychology Department of the University of Chicago since 1967. Just took a leave of absence from U. of C. and decided to postpone writing my Ph.D. thesis to do more exciting things - like teach at Central. Have been at CYCC since Fall, 1968 - what a trip!

Things I know something about and other interests

Academic background in Psychology, especially social psych. I also know something about other areas of psychology and some of the other social sciences (also biology and chemistry). Also have resources in human relations - am an intern in the YMCA-NTL training network.

Am interested in cities, especially the people in them. Also urban problems. I like architecture and am fascinated by Chicago's.

I like music, ranging from blues and rock to classical. Also arts and crafts type things, sewing etc.

Have been involved in various political groups concerning peace. pollution, civil rights, the anti-hunger campaign, women's libe[illegible]ion, etc.

Am interested in experiments in education.

Things I like

People caring, sharing, questioning, and growing.

Things that bug me

People whose world is only big enough for one, violence, hostility without basis.

Am willing to answer questions, try to help with problems, share my resources, etc.

JACKIE REDDY'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY (at least the part that seems relevant right now)

I came to Chicago four summers ago from California. At that time I had just graduated from the University of Santa Clare (a Jesuit not a state, school) with a major in English and minor in philosophy.

Since coming to Chicago I have spent a year working as a secretary at Billings Hospital, a year getting my master's degree in English at the Univ. of Chicago, a year teaching writing – Circle Campus, and finally this past year doing seminars at Central.

My function now is mainly to teach writing. This is quite ironic since up until the time I started teaching it, I regarded writing as THE most painful and frustrating thing in the world to do. I still have problems expressing myself on paper, but the more time I spend in the seminars, the easier it becomes.

English is by no means my only interest. I was a pre-med major for my first two years in college. I spent my third year studing German and other assorted subjects (including Life) in Vienna. I've also spent a summer wroking on a Peace-Corps like project in the mountains of Mexico. I like to do all kinds of outdoor things--tennis, skiing, swimming, hiking as well as indoor stuff--music, making candles, painting, sewing, cooking good food. Sometimes I get restless in the seminar... I don't like to sit around and do nothing when we could be doing a lot.... so make use of me.

If there's something you want to know about me that I didn't tell you, just ASK!

Staff Evaluations

"Is there a consensus among staff on ways of dealing with any problems? Are there leadership roles?"

"We probably had more successes the first part of the semester. More communication among ourselves, then we had at any other seminar. We tried. And quite often there was consensus. The problem is not so much consensus when we actually dealt out a problem, as it was simply not dealing out problems. The times we realized that we were doing something wrong and the times we were not faking or confused. That had to be faced up to. Once we faced up to this, sometimes it was very difficult, but we would reach some kind of consensus. I remember one case in particular that was extremely painful. The time when Bob came back after the first time we asked him not to come back. There have been consensus when we'd sought it and faced up to the need."

"Sometimes we have different ideological positions. We can't always agree on doing everything the same way. But I think we make consensus about doing something. We make a decision to do something even though all of us are not in total agreement. But I don't feel that everything we do is a consensus."

"When you're all together in the seminar and something's happening, what happens if there are different ways of dealing with it? Have there been conversations beforehand that'll make it easier on the people who can now understant what to do in that circumstance or had there been talking about the possibility of this kind of problem coming up and then being able to deal with it together?"

"I think that what's happening is that we in the process of doing this seminar, have gotten more experience to get together so that we work more as a team; if a problem comes up in a classroom situation, I think generally one of us can start dealing with it. Most of the time, we'll come in and either support that or if it needs to be brought out we probably can bring it out and discuss the problem, but I think that, for the most part, we've been handling any kind of disagreement."

"If I start something and put myself out on a limb, someone else is going to come in and do what they think is right to help. So that helps me a lot because I know that they understand what I'm trying to do or at least try to understand."

"There's one thing, I've been working in the seminar for more than a year and looking back I find that there was none of the togetherness among the members of the staff which were brought out over the past eight weeks, some times in front of the students or sometimes in staff meeting. I feel a lot of togetherness and I get a kind of feeling that, there's a lot of support coming from us for each other in most of the situations. I think there's a kind of concern and acceptance on the part of each of us. It gives me this kind of feeling. I don't have to worry about that kind of thing. You are together. This is a pretty strong feeling I have gotten this time.

"I'd like to say that -- I just want to reemphasize that we're working pretty well together. How we react to situations when they come up. We haven't completely developed tools to be able to anticipate things, to deal with them before they become critical, to help things progress at stages where it's not natural to want to help them progress. We sometimes let each other down I think, and I think that that's the weakness we have to deal with. It's just a matter of beginning now we've sort of caught up with how to deal with the immediate situations. Now it's a question of being able to anticipate, to be able to do a better job of screening people where they have real problems in the seminar and stuff like that. We haven't dealt. We haven't been successful. And I think we will be. It seems to me that we're getting better and better as we go along."

"Sometimes I think we have difficulty over some ideological differences which today are not ideological, in my mind. It's simply another side of the situation."

"You know-relating to what he said, about the grade thing. I was involved in that kind of situation. It seems to me that it's more or less related to the screening thing, you know, that we brought out before. We take any student that comes to the seminar, where you don't have to work, and you get twelve credits or fifteen credits at times; and that depresses me very much, because of the very basic idea of the seminar which allows you to be free and use the freedom in a very positive and constructive way. The thing that disturbs me is that it is used as the kind of situation where you don't have to do anything and you get twelve or fifteen credits and most of the time you get good grades at the same time. I think that is one of the problems that is related to grades in my mind. The other kind of problem that is related to grades is again an outcome of frustration, like if students do not show up for class, and if they don't participate and if they are not involved, then how can they evaluate themselves?"

"What effect has the absence of the professional trainer from the network had on staff or participants?"

"Well we talked about that. I don't know. One thing I would like very much and that is to have somebody there who could have been evaluating. A chance for me to develop my own skill by having a professional trainer. Somebody who knows more than I do, saying these things are good and these things are bad. I can find out my own in talking to other people but I would have appreciated, someone with a variety of skills, somebody who knew more in many areas."

"To put the word professional on your forehead by a combination of sheer grip and also a sort of mutual support which we talked about earlier. We've gotten through a lot of stuff and to some of us, pretty well. I, for one, don't want to get this thing so far advanced, professional training idea,

that it's not translatable into context other than the context what we're in. I want the kinds of methods that we've developed to have broad range and not to be dependent on the presence or the absence of a particular qualified person? I want us to be able to share what we do."

"What is desired for yourself through work in this Seminar?"

"I want to be rid of a whole bunch of old stuff that I want to destroy as thoroughly and completely as I can, at least for as many people as I can; old systems, a system of beliefs that become more than belief systems... and I move to do it."

"I have a lot of negative feelings about the society in general because of barriers that people build for themselves with other people and the seminar seems to me to be a place in which people can break down some of those barriers, particularly racial and age barriers, which I think are the two most predominant ones out there. I feel that we haven't been totally successful in breaking this down. I feel that some of those have been broken down between two individuals, but that as a group it hasn't been as successful as I would like to see it. I felt that I wished I knew more about how to help people do those kinds of things. One thing that the seminar has done for me which, I don't think was the goal in the first place but has turned out to be a good thing, is that it's killed a personal vaccum that I've had recently in my life in terms of finding people that I felt comfortable in relating to; I found that I'm eager to come to someone, and I really enjoy it, I like spending time with them and that I find it very easy in many ways to relate to people and to myself."

"Another goal for me, I guess, was to develop my own skills and to feel that I had in some ways become more aware of the things that I can do right than I was before. I guess it means that I have, and somewhere I feel, that I have been totally successful in learning as much about my weaknesses as I would like to. I feel in a way that people have been very uncritical of me, both staff and the students, the whole semester, and I don't think that I can think of a single time that I was jumped on for doing something by students.("What about time with...?") No, I didn't feel jumped on. I felt that she was expressing her feelings about being pushed, but I didn't feel that she was directly after me because of something bad that I did. I think it was just the whole issue. I feel that one of the things that I haven't learned as much as I would like to is about the negative kinds of things."

"The seminar is a kind of realization to some extent of the dream I have been cherishing in my life since I started teaching. The seminar to me means one of the milestones in my life and I look back, and say my goodness, I started teaching as a teacher where I thought the best thing in the world was to lecture; and arrest the attention of forty or fifty or a hundred students, for one or two hours, and get a lot of praise. From that stage which was the earlier stage to this stage I'm reminded of a script from India which means the teacher says nothing bysaying nothing, and the students learn by resolving their conflicts themselves."

"That's the best teaching and that has been in my mind for a long time I think that the seminar offers me a kind of good opportunity for me to learn more about myself and realize some of the things that I have cherished very deeply in my life, such as how can we make education meaningful and relevant to individuals. How can the people whom we call students and teachers get really involved in the process of learning so that it becomes their education, it does not become somebody elses education, it becomes his own education and the involvement implies discovery of interests, goals, potentials, strengths, limitations, working on them so that I feel all the time that I am educating myself, I am learning, I am not being taught by somebody. That's the basis of the seminar as far as I am concerned. I think involvement is a very important work for me which implies involvement in the process of learning and also involvement with others like how can I relate myself to others and develop a kind of community, a loving community, rather than simply doing my thing, in a kind of isolated situation. How can I be responsive to me as to others, that kind of education. That's an overall goal as far as the seminar is concerned."

"I am struggling hard in my mind as to how we can make students understand that the traditional material that we are supposed to cover in general psych or social psych or personalities and so on, are more or less given in text books and are not the most important things in life. There's grain of truth, how can I relate myself to the things that are in the book, or how can I relate myself to my own experiences and the experiences of others and learn from these things rather than simply covering a particular course material. And that's why. if you go to the requirements that I have and respond to my own conflicts by giving an opportunity to somebody that might have that kind of significance, I would like to learn the basic thing from this course in general psych, so that I don't have to suffer, if I go from this point to another point."

"But there are other things besides this that are more important from one specific point of view; like what kind of psychological data I can collect about myself which I can use for my own emotional development. How can I understand others -- what kind of psychological data I can collect from others that I can use for my own emotional development? What is the value of disclosing myself, you know... social acts of this taking, for example, how do I know about myself by taking some risk and also encouraging others to take risks? These kinds of things are more important to me in terms of the realization of the goals. I think it's a hard battle to fight, both for me as it is for anybody involved in this process. I don't think there are easy answers to these kind of problems, because I have certain rules which I have developed. I am fighting, I have been fighting. The students have probably a greater battle to fight, because they are still young, and certain things might have influence on them. So these are the kinds of problems we are going to face, but I think its the risk that's really taken because it is very involved -- has been very involved."

"Going back to the skill question now -- the communication question -- I had a very interesting discussion today with Ed and I learned several things from him today which to some extent, aren't social questions. I don't know how applicable to others this is but as an introspection. He tole me that he had never been able to learn effectively, from books or from just writing. And I said how have you learned so far -- what is the most effective way of learning. He said, when somebody talks to him on

a person-to-person basis, he gets a lot out of it because there is interaction and it's always relevant, because when we talk to somebody, if it's irrelevant the guy will simply walk out, and this is never the way with the book, because the book is there and you can never argue with the book -- the book will never be relevant to you because it's a book and you don't have a chance to interact and react to each other, and he told me that one of the books that he read, Siddhartha, he could relate himself to that book and then he said he would like to have more communication with himself as far as that book is concerned. Now I consider this as one of the ways of developing interest in reading and at the same time developing communication skills. Besides, he was really interested in talking about himself -- he was free -- he was feeling free to relate himself to me and I was feeling the same way towards himself."

"We were really understanding each at a very deep level, which I consider a good kind of skill. Number two, the other kind of skill is about Bill who is also in the seminar. One of the brightest things that I learned about him in the seminar was when brought out that this is the first time in his life that he always comes to class, you know, on his own, and stays all the way until 1:15. He would like to stay but has to work and that's why he leaves at 1:15 and this is the first time that he has been reading books and writing and developing those kinds of skills that we are talking about. We want the people to identify their interest -- what they are interested in -- what is more significant or important to them and use the various sources like books, other sources to respond to their interests and respond to something that is very meaningful to them. We could really develop skills in a way that is more helpful than, you know, asking somebody all right, write five pages of a composition on something or we are going to read five books during the week."

"I wonder though whether perhaps some of that hasn't worked for you because of your own particular skills in relating to people. I found -- you know I've had conversations with people and I've had some things come out but not those kinds of things. I find it hard a number of times. I've asked does anyone want help in anything and very few people will say yes. And I find it difficult to just sit down and initiate the kinds of conversations which turn out to be productive as the ones you've had -- or at least the two that you've described. And so I'm not sure that it's any particular thing -- maybe there's something about your ability to listen."

"In response to you, in both the situations, the Ed situation and the Bill situation, I took the initiative because I felt like taking the initiative. In the case of Bill, I said "Well, Bill, it seems to me that you are interested in doing something -- let's talk about it. Don't look upon me like a teacher who is asking you to do this thing with him. Let's really talk." I knew beforehand that he was interested in drugs. In the case of Ed, I had such a strong urge today, to relate myself to him -- very strong feeling and I couldn't stop it and I just put my arm around his shoulders -- I'm going to talk to him today, and he was very happy about it. In fact, he was kind of waiting as though it were for me. The point that you brought out, that individual conferences coming out of our own concern and interest

really get to people an opportunity to open up. Peculiar probably to school is that somebody will come and ask them to do something but I think we do it in a somewhat different way than in the traditional way, because we are really concerned about the individual and you are too, I'm pretty sure."

"For me the most important thing we haven't learned to demonstrate yet is that you can learn from everything. Now, we still haven't gotten to the point where people are so keen that even when something doesn't work, they pick up on it and they use it; instead, people still have a failure and feel bad. But they can learn from everything and I think this is one of the things about potential that we don't realize. It's always there and you can always do that. I think it's beginning to happen, now people are beginning to realize that."

"I think the real difference, too, in listening skills in my other course, when people could not hear what I said and they went right on and I went back and asked them had they heard and they said no and the contrast was really brought out very sharply for me at that point because that kind of thing rarely happens in the seminar now -- People are very conscious of listening and hearing. And people are more reluctant to interrupt each other than they are in other kinds of classroom situations and I think even than they were earlier."

"I think that's a point that I had not thought of. You use the word listening skill in a kind of a vague general way, like there are listening tapes, good listening still, but that's one kind of listening. But, the kind of listening that Diane has been talking about is more or less listening to the person, and getting in touch with his feelings as to what he really wants to say and how can I help him by listening to him -- that kind of listening. This I think is very different from the kind of listening we usually talk about."

"The other kind of skills that I think I have seen more of this time than any other time in the seminar is interviewing people: there are two or three projects going on in the seminar and people interview on the tape recorders making use of audio/visual aids much more than it has been done before. The tape recorder is used by the students this time than it has ever been used by the students before. It is such kind of skills that Diane talked about, like writing questionnaires, analyzing the data, using a variety of techniques of collecting data -- these kinds of skills in my mind are great skills for tutors who have never been exposed to this before."

"The fact that people are learning more and more to develop the skills, asking for help when they need it. I think that part of it grows out of this kind of workshop experience but I'm seeing it a little bit more in the human relations kind of experience where people feel more free to ask for what they want or to express their needs. I feel that this is in a way something which didn't go far enough. I certainly would have liked to see people feel much more free than they seem to be about expressing their needs and asking for help. But I feel like for some people it isn't easy to do that."

Student Evaluation

The Seminar class was a thoroughly heterogenous group, with a population of 2/3 male, 2/3 Black, a broad range of ages, backgrounds and experiences. They were required to take the Comparative Guidance and Placement Program Test (CGP). The results held no bearing on a students' acceptance into the Seminar. Students were also given copies of the Syllabus: a guide for what they would be dealing with.

Seminar I: Search for Identity
Syllabus

I. Introduction

The only good way for us as instructors to begin our presentation of this seminar to you is to tell you some of the reasons why we are involved. These are value-judgments which we share or are willing to work with; they represent our concerns and committments for the real "subject matter" of this course - you as individuals and the whole group of us as a potential community. But you should not accept these statements without question. They are texts for reflection and discussion.

A) Education

Education should be liberation rather than indoctrination.

There are no answers in the back of the book to the questions which are important. Education should consist of real human experiences and reflection on those experiences. Real learning takes place when it matters to us, when the questions (and answers, if there are any) make a difference in our lives.

Education should be experimental; it should involve risks, and the possibility of creating something new. If we want to learn, we have to be willing to change and to grow.

This kind of education deals with ends as well as means, values as well as techniques. Knowing "how" without knowing "why" is meaningless. But nothing is sacred; we should be free to challenge any values, and able to accept challenges to our own values as possibilities for growth.

Teaching is obsolete. We have to help each other learn; and anyone who is not in the educational process to learn is in the wrong place, no matter how many degrees he has.

B) Identity

A man's quest for identity is his attempt to take his destiny in his own hands. It is self-love, in the best sense of the word.

The paradox of identity is that a man discovers himself and creates himself at the same time. I can be what I want to be; but what I want to be depends on who I am. I can only be free if I am true to myself but I am free to change.

If someone says "I found my identity" there's nothing to say in return. If he's right, nothing we say will make any difference. If he's wrong, he's going to have to find out for himself. When we admit that we are searching we can talk to each other.

In an unchanging world, identity could be fixed, rigid, and closed. We could "make up our minds" once and for all. But our world is changing, evolving so fast that it seems that we live in perpetual revolution; so our identities must be fluid, flexible, open to new experiences and new meanings. In our world, living without growing is death.

C) Community

We can not search for identity in private. We discover ourselves in and through each other; and what we make of ourselves is what we choose to be in relation to each other.

If you know me, you will know the kind of community that I will live and die for.

We live in a world that teaches us (mainly) how to "get ours". The future of the world depends on something different; the ability of men to learn how to involve themselves in satisfying and creative relationships with each other and to find ways to build the kinds of communities that will sustain those relationships. What we need, therefore, are situations in which we can experiment freely with the process of creating such communities-free associations of learning, growing individuals. This is what education has to be about.

There is no magical way to create a community. Love and trust are useless without committment and discipline; we have to learn how to receive and to give. But this is the kind of knowledge worth fighting for.

II. Some general objectives and purposes of the seminar.

What should a seminar called Search for Identity accomplish? On the basis of the values we have been formulating, some goals might be:

1) developing individual freedom and integrity;
2) understanding and accepting ourselves;
3) understanding each other and the ways in which we want to relate to each other;
4) growing in the ability to communicate both feelings and thoughts;
5) building a community among the members of the seminar which will support and nurture individual growth and help us learn new ways of living with other people;
6) developing as individuals (and perhaps as a group) committments and values which we can carry beyond the seminar into the rest of our education and the rest of our lives;

7) discovering techniques for implementing these values and committments among ourselves and in other situations;
8) learning what the various disciplines in the seminar (English, Psychology, Philosophy, Human Relations) mean in themselves and how they relate to the quest for identity;
9) creating new kinds of education - new uses of materials, new kinds of personal involvement, new kinds of instructor-student relationships, etc. - which are related to these goals.

Resources

This is primarily a list of the books we have put on order at Economy Bookstore, 171 W. Madison. There are many other books which we know to be relevant, and many you may want to suggest. We can have parts of books duplicated. We can also use tapes, movies, etc.

Books on order: (all paperback)

American Dream & Zoo Story	by Edward Albee
Giovanni's Room	by James Baldwin
Siddhartha	by Herman Hesse
Gandhi's Autobiography	
Soul On Ice	by Eldridge Cleaver
Walden II	by B.F. Skinner
Gandhi's Truth	by Erik Erikson
Freedom to Learn	by Carl Rogers
Great Dialogues of Plato	
Encounters: Issues of Human Concern	

The main resource, of course, is ourselves - and the time we have to "spend" together.

The student evaluation to be used in this report are excerpts from tape recordings dealing with normal and abnormal behavior in the Seminar.

Student Evaluation

"From your own concept of normality have you observed any abnormalities within the class, within the seminar, either personally with individuals or group abnormalities, and if so, would you express these?"

"As far as what all these people have been doing, their kind of behavior, it seems to me that most of them are exhibiting what I might call sub-normal behavior as opposed to completely abnormal. I think there have been a couple of people here who have been, well, I can't say deranged because that's a very strong word, but it seems like a couple of people actually needed certain kinds of psychotherapy beyond this kind of session. It seems generally the people were coming out of their own environments, backgrounds, whatever, but I can't classify it as something abnormal."

"Would you describe your definition of the difference between abnormal and sub-normal, and describe the particular actions of people you considered either abnormal or sub-normal, and why you think this exists?"

"Sub-normal, I would think gererally says that a person's behavior is not directly perfect. Perfect in a sense that a 'normal' would be a kind of direction, a goal to be gotten to. Perfect behavior would be the kind of behavior that a person would try to reach or try to get to and that would involve things that you mentioned before --- 'coping'. To be able to completely cope with situations. Being very conscious and aware of what's going on so much so that you're conscious of yourself, you're conscious of what's going on with other people, you're conscious of impressions, you're conscious of how to deal with all these things. And sub-normal would mean to me then people who cannot quite deal this way. People who don't cope completely. People who aren't conscious of what they're doing. This I guess would generally be 99.9% of the population. Abnormal then would be a marked defraction from all of this so that the person is actually mentally retarded or diseased --- a percentage of the sub-normals. A person who is actually needing real psychotherapy. Sub-normal would be the general population, normal would be to me the person or those people who have a kind of ability to cope, the ability to be able to handle situations. So that, generally then, the people here, I think, exhibit sub-normal behavior. There have been, one or two whom I would consider abnormal. I think Jeff was going through all kinds of paranoid strange things. As far as I am concerned, he was not really getting the kind of help he needed here. The kinds of help he needed would have come best from all kinds of professional people, over a long period of time. Generally for the people here, it's been behavior that's their own kind of coping behavior, which is trying to be kind of normal, like trying to be conscious, trying to be coping, trying to be able to handle situations.

"I'll deal with healthy versus unhealthy. For me, this is a crucial issue. It's much more crucial than normal versus abnormal. For me, health means the ability to grow and sickness means that which interferes with growth. Sickness, psychological sickness, I'm not sure I even like the phrase, psychological sickness or whatever, but the kinds of pathologies that you find in psychology are essentially vicious circles instead of a person being in a position where he can develop and change and learn and respond; he gets into a vicious circle where he hurts himself one way; in order to correct from hurting himself that way, he hurts himself another way. And because he feels bad about himself he wants other people to feel bad about him and then he feels worse about himself and because he needs a drug at a particular time, he decides that he needs it forever. And so he eventually does need it forever because he keeps doing more and more, but these are all vicious circles. I think that there are some examples of people who manifest sort of pure forms of vicious circle kind of behavior. Some of these people are that way, generally and have been fighting against it in the seminar. Some of them have been that way and are still that way. The case of Bob is a good substantial sort of demonstration point anyway. It involves a guy trying to deal out a set of problems which are so big for him that he constantly takes the easy way out from them and then, therefore, feels bad about himself and intensifies his problems more and doesn't seem to finish things. But there have been times during the seminar that I felt Bob was really trying to face up to things and then he'd sort of drift back, trying to deal. You can't tell utimately about the answer to this kind of question unless you find out what happens. And in the long run, the long run is what tells you. The long run is what gives you the clue as to whether a person is acting in a way conducive to his health or in a way that perpetuates his problems. Jeff sometimes appears to me to be perpetuating his problems by complicating them."

"About the only thing person I could call abnormal would be Steve. He's a different kind of instructor, someone I never encountered before. His ideas on teaching, methods he uses. It bothered me at times because I was looking for him to change back into the teacher I identify with. I asked myself was I going to learn anything in here, what he said about things worried me until I got to know him and I began to feel that he was actually here learning with us."

"When I think of normality, I just think of what would be normal for my behavior and so, if I spoke about what's normal, what I think is abnormal for someone else, I really mean what's abnormal for me."

"I would think that fear of one's fellows or judgment of yourself would be abnormal because if you accept yourself you can be upset that somebody would not be too pleased with what you were doing or saying or it can bother you for a minute; but it will not upset your judgment of yourself. So that I'd say that a real fear of what people would think of you or holding back from other people, afraid to relate to other people for fear of being hurt could be considered, I would consider this an abnormality."

"I find it hard to deal with the question except I've tried to define the problem. I am very much against the use of the word normal as a value term. As a value term it runs contrary to all my assumptions because normal means standard or average or something like that in the usual definition. It means what's acceptable, and I have found in teaching that, given that definition, being normal is not a value at all, it's much more value to be abnormal. At least it's a starting point because being normal means being prohibited from serious concern and commitment. Because those things on the average in this society are against the norm. I'm against the norm. I'm abnormal so I don't use it as a value judgement in that kind of way. I can't. I can say normal, it means such and such and I can do something like quoting David Riessman to talk about other direct matter, talking about what happens in the suburbs or some kind of fuzzy generalizations about what most Americans do and they say, this is abnormal, this is not normal, in that light. And in that light the whole seminar is not normal. And people who try normal behavior in the seminar are seen as less valuable. So I suppose the question I've got to ask you before I go on is are you talking normal in the sense of opposed to the average or are you talking about normal in the sense of something which is pathological in some dangerous sort of way. I mean abnormal, obviously."

"Not necessarily in the pathological sense and I don't mean normal as the Babbitt type of normal because it wouldn't be my idea of what would be good, prehaps, more the psychological definition of normal. In a sense, it would be, my own definition. A mentally sort of healthy person who would be able to cope with their environment and situations, that has a fairly healthy self-respect and respect for other individuals. Who also has, and I think I'd kind of go to Carl Rogers there, a kind of superconsciousness or awareness of one's self, one's surroundings and what is happening to one and his surroundings."

"Well, right now, I'm going through re-evaluating my own values too; it's kind of hard to say exactly what is normal but I can say for me someone like Dewey, little Dewey's defensiveness would be abnormal for me, maybe it's normal for him, again."

"Just how would you feel, I mean you feel it would be abnormal for you, but do you feel there's anything abnormal in it just as behavior? The question is not so much what's abnormal for you so much as what would be a standard of normality, more or less. Do you feel that this would be abnormal, his defensiveness -- in just normal behavior? How do you feel about it?"

"I think that maybe any severe extreme would be abnormal. Like if you're defensive about anything that's even said to the extent that you won't even hear it, you're just busy defending yourself then, for me, that would be abnormal. I'd be unhappy. Maybe I'm saying that normality is what I would want to be rather than what I am, talking about my ideals and what would be abnormal for what my ideals are, rather than what I am."

"Would you want to elaborate on that any more, from the aspect of Dewey, his own defensiveness -- or have you found it much in other particular individuals or have you found any other traits or actions -- particular actions -- that you would consider abnormal?"

"I found the same kind of defensiveness in Jeff, except that I think he's going through -- maybe it's not defensiveness, maybe it's just like a trick kind of game, you know where he's testing, testing; and testing's normal but when all you're ever doing is testing and you never pick up on a relationship where you're involved -- I think that's sort of abnormal for me or for what I'd want to be. I don't think that I'd test to that extent. Or if I do, its a lot more subtle. What else. I think worrying can be sort of abnormal when it's really severe. Diane worries a lot, but I really appreciate her concern. I don't know if that's abnormal. She doesn't do it really to the extent that I'm uncomfortable with it, but Dewey and Jeff really make me uncomfortable. And they really make me uncomfortable when they get that defensive and tricky."

"I think Ralph generates an awful lot of social pressure, where everyone gets self-conscious, mostly the black students about how they should react. Social pressures are all over the whole group, too. But that's normal."

"I think maybe Bill's reactions a lot of the times seem abnormal to me just simply because he won't react. He'll just sit there and sit there and then, all of a sudden, he'll come out with a burst of something, anger, and when he hasn't been contributing, and that bothers me. That would be abnormal for me. Well, sometimes that's normal but I think when it's to that extent where you're holding it in and holding it in then all of a sudden -- poom."

"Do you feel that particular holding back has been a characteristic of many of the students in this class and if so, could you describe which ones and why you particularly think this would be abnormal."

"A lot of people haven't. There've only been about five or six who really have opened up at least a little about their feelings and maybe their own personal backgrounds; whereas, people can't -- maybe they're just afraid to be known. Like that incident that happened to me when Dewey kept generalizing, saying, 'some people, some people,' and I said what do you mean by some people? Then he jumped on me -- you're afraid of yourself, you're, you, you, you. Then Dana jumped in on that -- like she felt that I was ripping people apart and putting them on an analysis. People I guess they're afraid of being understood. It's kind of scary I guess but I'd like it. Because if everyone knew what everyone else was thinking it would be so nice, but I guess people just don't want to let go. I think that's abnormal. Well, if normality is what usually occurs, then it's normal because it's everywhere; but, it's so unsatisfying."

"We can also approach this from a different way. Now, Freud was once asked what his concept of normality was. And they expected a long lengthy answer and what they got was -- the ability to love and to work. We all have our own concepts of normality according to our own cultural backgrounds and subjective or objective models. We also have -- especially in something like the seminar, we've been exposed to such unusual circumstances that I think it's set most of us thinking and we've, perhaps, evolved slightly different methods or concepts of normality. I have. So why don't you take it from what you say would be just a basic idea of your own normality and then continue again with what you would consider to be abnormal that's appeared in the seminar.

"When I usually think of normality, I think of what would usually occur with the most amount of people, the norm. And I think the same thing with me -- what would usually occur with me would be normal and then something different for me would be abnormal -- let's see what would be abnormal for me -- like if in the middle of a happy discussion, all of a sudden I'd start crying. That would be abnormal for me. But then, I can think of abnormal or normal and what I would want to be abnormal -- for normal being good, I want to be pleasent, have an equilibrium, maybe that isn't normal -- maybe that doesn't usually occur. They're different -- if you're asking me like value questions -- like what I think is right and wrong, it's different from what I think is normal. Normal I would think would be what usually occurs and maybe I would consider myself an abnormal person. Yeh, at least I have a definition now. There's a personal normality and societal normality and taking our seminar, like a society of people -- the normality would be to shut off and not to contribute and to complain -- that's what the normality has been. It's been the usual thing with our group and, then, there's been a small amount of people who have contributed and that's like abnormal in our seminar. To have really been contributing

and expressing your feelings about yourself and everyone els. And it's normal in our seminar not to get too involved -- to stay cool, to be able to laugh and be defensive."

"Well, this is perhaps a leading question. I don't know if it's too valid in an interview like this, but what about those that have expressed feelings but really basically, hostilely, every-time they express them."

"In our seminar that's been normal -- to defensively express your feelings. I don't know if that means that they want to have their feelings dealt with, you know. That's the normal to just be defensive, that is expressing a feeling but it's expressing it in a way like -- 'don't get near me' kind of feeling -- like I feel this way but don't get near me. Don't deal with me -- I want you to pay attention to me, but don't get near the problem. And that's been pretty normal. Does that answer it?"

"I'd really like the societal norm to come together with my personal norm. Where everyone would want what I want for normality has been like abnormal in the group. Pretty abnormal. There've been about, I guess, five or six people who've wanted the same things, I guess."

"Well express exactly then what you would want as a norm in the group."

"In the group, I'd want as a norm -- for a personality norm -- well I don't suppose that would be good -- if everyone has the same one. But, really being honest with ourselves, and then being able to express it honestly with the group would be beautiful. It's rarely happened. Honesty has been pretty abnormal, I guess in the group."

"Are there any particular cases of that, that you can recall so far in the seminar?"

"Yes, especially Dewey and Jeff have been super dishonest with themselves in my opinion." "Why do you think so? What is abnormal about it?"

"Again, when I said that I felt it's abnormal, I'm talking about it would be abnormal for me to get that defensive, unless I was being attacked. But like no one has really been super attacked. It's been like little subtle things that aren't really that bad, to me. Even when I did get super attacked, it was something that I could deal with honestly and I shouldn't have even felt attacked. That was my own personal hangup, feeling hurt when I should have been able to look at it objectively."

"Do you feel that the attack was at all abnormal the way it happened?"

"It's been normal in our classroom. Well, it is an attack in its defensive way, like don't get near me, I'll attack you. Just don't come past my fence. But that time it got a little extensive, I guess -- intense."

"What would you think, in the people you've already mentioned, such as Jeff, Dewey, Dana, and Bill -- you can take one of them or you can go ahead with all of them. As a responsive human being who's been doing some psychological reading or from your own feelings -- what do you think would cause them to react in this manner which you consider to be abnormal -- both as you express it or as I understand it -- both personally and societally."

"I think we've all gone through different environments and our values are pretty different. Or maybe some of us feel more guilty about our values than others or about our personal feelings and we want to hide them more and more afraid of them being known. And I suppose living in the suburbs or living in the city, being Black, being white, being Jewish, being Catholic, any kind of a different background would create a different kind of normality figure, of normality feelings and personality behaviors. I don't really know from any books because I don't read a lot, but then even in the suburbs, people have different specific normality things but I suppose generally, they're the same culturally. And Dana's brought in different ones from where she's been and I've brought in different ones from where I've been, you've brought in different ones. There hasn't been much, you know, I suppose we all brought in our own and they should be able to get together, but I suppose some people go through really, really rugged environments where the walls are just built up so thick. And I guess that's what would differentiate the feelings about it. But, if you can get past that and look at it on a general scale, like, past your cultural background and then think of what you would rather have for your own values, then that shouldn't even matter; but, I suppose it does."

At the completion of the Seminar Students were asked to evaluate their Seminar experiences through the use of three questionnaires. The following are samplings of responses from those questionnaires. (See Appendicies A and B for the complete questionnaires.)

Question: What had you expected from the Seminar?

Responses: I expected my problems and needs to be dealt with, as well as, to deal with the problems and needs of others in the class. I also hoped that we would become a community.

Debates, actions, acceptance of each other, prehaps not really really understanding but being sensitive.

I wasn't sure what to expect.

I expected to learn more about myself and how I react to different people in different situations. I wanted the group to give me honest feedback.

Question: In what ways were your expectation not fulfilled?

Responses: We were not a working community.

I didn't get as much feedback as I would have liked.

I failed in some ways.

My needs were ignored.

Question: What was the most useful course during the Seminar? (English, Psychology, etc.)

Responses: Psychology - Carl Rogers writings made me feel that I was really understanding myself.

Human Relations - Now I relate to people a lot more freely.

Communications - I was able to get information and help with other papers I was writing.

For me all the courses were combined as one, to work together, I really could not separate one and say it was the most valuable.

Question: How could you apply your Seminar skills and knowledge to every day life?

Responses: Maintain my openness.

I can understand, listen, be more sensitive, and relate to others feelings better.

I can get along with people a little better than I could before.

I can apply some of the techniques we've learned in the group I work with.

NEGATIVE POINTS:

We have encountered numerous problems, some we have been able to work through, others are waiting to be tackled.

One of our answered questions is whether or not employed and unemployed students can effectively reach common goals in the Seminar. As a participant-observer, in my opinion, effective integration of these two groups of students is improbable. I found that students who are employed full-time, who have responsibilities for not only themselves but for families, as well, who are attending classes on released-time place greater value on their classroom time than the unemployed, living with parents, kind of students. The employed student feels a necessity for having some kind of credentials for employment mobility and are anxious to speed up the process.

The seminar schedule for the eight week period was four days per week, four hours per day. This presented a problem in gaining released-time. It hindered enrollment, partly because of the summer season and agency activities, but also, Center Directors felt that they could not afford that much released-time. Our solution is to adjust the on going schedule to the needs of YMCA employers by extending the schedule, two days per week, two hours per day. As expressed during the evaluation interviews, there is mixed emotions as to the need for an experienced trainer. In my opinion, there is that need, for giving feedback to instructors on their methods and techniques in human relations. It would be helpful in spotting troubled students, students who need psychological help.

The problem of people not knowing how to use freedom,involving many feeling that they have not in fact ever experienced freedom. The seminar structure gives students the feedom to learn as much or, in some cases as little, as they choose. This deviates so far from the old system of education that it becomes frustrating for many students. The instructors are left with the question because there are so many differences in an individual's tolerance of frustration.

Another problem is that we are so used to playing games that we don't know how to act without them, yet game-playing is contrary to openness and honesty. We are accustomed to dealing with others competitively rather than cooperatively.

The Seminar accepts any student and this lack of screening has presented a number of problems. A student with serious emotional problems had to be asked to leave the Seminar, after professional help was found for him. Students who refuse to accept a new method of learning and teaching became frustrated because they were unwilling to give up the old beliefs.

POSITIVE POINTS:

There is a continued striving for more openness and freedom. The relationships begun in the Seminar have continued at its conclusion. People became freer to relate to each other on a human basis. The Seminar was a testing ground for new behavior patterns with personal respect for roles. Students and instructors had an opportunity to rid themselves of previous orientations. For everyone involved this was a test of patience, and perserverance. Lastly, students began to see education as both meaningful and interesting.

FUTURE PLANS:

Pilot "C" will have a testing period from January to September 1971, during Phase III. We will seek participants from the entire YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago rather than limit participation to one specific district. Eligibility standards: YMCA employee, little or no college background, sincere interest and concern for better positions in the human services.

To accommodate District and Center Directors on released-time a new schedule for classes has been worked out: two days per week, two hours per day; for each eleven week period and testing at least eight additional courses from SSAP-I core curriculum. These will be selected from the following:

Orientation to Social Service
Community Resources
Communications II
Human Growth and Development
Abnormal Psychology
American Ethnic Groups
Social Problems
Human Biology
Practicum
Sociology

We will again utilize the Central YMCA Community College Seminar for both testing of courses and teaching staff.

YMCA-NTL trainers will be asked to work with the Seminar Staff and assist in the supervision of the practicum training.

Participants will be assigned, in pairs, for practicum training, to a Center or Project. This training will cover services and operations of the Center or Project, e.g., membership, program design, promotion, and interpretation, budget preparation, record keeping and work with a selected group of people utilizing its services.

Acknowledgements

John Bouseman, Dean, Central YMCA Community College

Dr. J.P. Dave, Instructor, YMCA Community College

Steve Andrews, Instructor, YMCA Community College

Diane Franklin, Instructor, YMCA Community College

Jackie Reddy, Instructor, YMCA Community College

APPENDIX A

Participant Questionnaire

Please answer questions as briefly as possible. Extra space is provided on the back of the sheets for elaboration

SECTION I

1. What had you expected from the Seminar?

2. To what extent were your expectations fulfilled?
Completely____To a large extene____To some extent_____
Comment:

3. In what ways were your expectations not fulfilled?

4. Are you glad you participated in this Seminar?
very glad____glad____not sure____sorry____very sorry____
Comment:

5. Would you prefer to have been in another kind of class?
Comment:

SECTION II

The following evaluation concerns how your perceptions and feelings about the group have changed since the beginning of the semester. Circle the number that best expresses how you see it. 1-a lot less; 2-less; 3-no change; 4-more; 5-a lot more

Acceptance of each other	]2345
Cocern for others	]2345
Friendliness among group members	12345
Freedom to express oneself to others	12345
Lover for each other	12345
Sincerity among group members	12345
A true understanding of each other	12345
Support of each others thoughts, feelings, beliefs	12345
Rejection of other members of the group	12345
Hostility shown toward other members of the group	12345
Fear among members of certain individuals	12345
Anxiety about members or situations	12345
Frustration among the group	12345
Interest shown by members of the group	12345
Involvement from members of the group	12345
Creativity	12345
Selfishness among members of the group	12345
Conflict within the group	12345
Understanding and acceptance of group goals	12345
Serious work attitude	12345

The following evaluation concerns changes in your perceptions and feelings about yourself. Circle the number that best expresses how you have changed since the beginning of the semester
1-a lot less; 2-less; 3-no change; 4-more; 5-a lot more

Acceptance of yourself	12345
Understanding of yourself	12345
Frustration	12345
Anxiety about yourself	12345
Rejection by others	12345
Involvement	12345
Contribution to your own and others welfare	12345
Concern for yourself and for others	12345
Friendliness on your part toward others	12345
Hostility on your part toward others	12345
Love for yourself and for others	12345
Freedom with yourself in the group	12345
Dependence on others	12345
Sense of or use of your imagination	12345
Sense of your own creativity	12345
Sincerity on your part	12345
Understanding and acceptance of group goals	12345
Serious work attitudes	12345

Looking back over the GROUP evaluation list which category do you think is the most important for the welfare of the broup? Why do you feel this way?

Can you describe how this change came about in the group?

Looking back over the PERSONAL evaluationlist, which category do you consider to be the most important to you, as an individual? Why do you feel this way?

Can you describe how this change came about? What contributed to the change in you?

SECTION III

1. To what extent did the Seminar help you in devleoping a basic understanding in Psychology, Philosophy, English, Human Relations? (1-very little; 2-little; 3-not sure; 4-some; 5-greatly)

Psychology	12345
Philsosphy	12345
English	12345
Human Relations	12345

2. To what extent would you feel adequate to participate in a traditionally structured, competitive kind of class: to a great extent_____to some extent_____to a small extent____

3. To what extent has the Seminar helped you to develop the following communication skills (1-very little; 2-a little; 3-not sure; 4-some; 5-a lot)

Reading	12345
Writing	12345
Listening	12345
Expressing yourself verbally in a group	12345

4. In what ways did the Seminar help you the most?

5. In what ways did the Seminar help you the least?

6. Prior to the Seminar, how did you feel about college education?
pleasant_____exciting_____meaningful_____unpleasant_____boring_____

7. How do you feel now about college education?
pleasnat_____exciting____meaningful_____unpleasant____boring____

8. List those things you liked most about the Seminar:

9. List those things you liked least:

10. If you had a choice, would you want to be in this kind of Seminar next semester?

11. What suggestions would you offer for improving the Seminar?

12; Additional comments:

APPENDIX B

SEMINAR QUESTIONNAIRE - I

SCALE: 1 2 4 5

(low) (high)

Rate yourself using the above scale. Respond to each question concerning Community / Group and Personal needs, by putting the appropriate number for yourself in the space before the question.

____ 1. How much responsibility did I feel to the Community?

____ 2. How well was I listened to in the Community?

____ 3. How much did the community respond to my needs by acting?

____ 4. To what degree did I influence people in the Community without being put down?

____ 5. To what extent was I recognized in my Community?

____ 6. To what extent were these experiences helpful in my everyday situations?

____ 7. To what degree did I feel the "we-feeling" in my Community?

____ 8. Did I deal with personal confrontation deffectively?

____ 9. To what degree did I inflence the Community?

____ 10. To what degree was I sensitive to needs and feelings of individual Community members?

____ 11. To what extent did I respond to individual needs of my group members?

____ 12. To what degree did I trust the Community to deal with my feelings?

SEMINAR QUESTIONNAIRE - II

1. What was the most significant event for you during the Seminar?

   (Describe the event, your reactions to it, your feelings about it)

   a. What was the least significant? (Describe)

2. What was the most useful course during the Seminar? (English, Psychology, etc.)

   (Describe your reactions to it, your feelings about it)

   a. What was the least? (Describe)

3. How could you apply your Seminar skills and knowledge to everyday life.

Name_____

For Discussion

Feel free to write, doodle, draw, fold, spindle, anything you like to do with this page --- just simply create something which you think represents the Seminar experience. Please remember to write your name.

Phase II Final Report

INTERPRETIVE ANALYSIS OF YMCA PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION

Prepared by Jeanette Hall

Project No. 7-0329
Grant No. OEG-0-8-070329-3694 (085)
SOCIAL SERVICE AIDE PROJECT
For the Training and Education
of Paraprofessionals

September 30, 1970

Career Options Research and Development
-A Special Project of
the Young Men's Christian Association
19 South La Salle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60603

This project is supported by the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Research, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under Section 4 (c) of the Vocational Education Act, 1963. Points of view or opinions do not, however, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education
Bureau of Research

The National Council of YMCAs adopted a new employee classification plan in 1969. Under this present system Community Professionals (street workers, counsellors, etc.) have a more clearly defined position within the organization's structure. However, this system does not represent a career ladder that allows for employee mobility with the least amount of time and expense, nor the achievement of comprehensive knowledge, skills, and know-how.

This paper will make a comparison of the YMCA's former and present employee classification plan to that of the human services career ladder developed by Career Options.

For additional information, see Phase II Final Report on Career Ladders and Core Curriculum.

FORMER	PRESENT	PILOT "C"	LIFE/WORK EXP.
		Professional: Doctor's Degree Master's Degree	6 yrs. of progressive experience with Equivalency Examination.
Group 4: Secretaries. Persons employed full time to deal with program, policy or admn. have served acceptably at least 2 yrs. and completed "thirty semester hrs" academic requirement or establishing equivalent in grad. study, and have been certified by the Board of Certification	Senior Directors: Staff members wo have completed a 2 yr. period of demonstrated competence as a Director; (1) if a college grad. one of tnese: (a) 3 units of YMCA Career Development Program (b) a grad. degree (either before or after employment) and the first unit of the Career Development Program (APPD) (c) 15 semester hrs. of study in a relevant discipline, and 2 Career Development Units. (2) if not a college grad. (former staff associate) (a) completion of 3 units of Career Development program (b) completion of at least 15 semester hrs. of relevant college study (c) 2 additional years of satisfactory service as a YMCA Director (total of 4 yrs.).		

FORMER	PRESENT	PILOT "C"	LIFE/WORK EXP.
roup 3: Junior Secetaries. Persons mployed full-time to eal with YMCA policy, rogram or admn., ualified by college rad. or educational quivalent, church embership or equivaent statement of faith, and a certificate of good health. Do not fully meet requirements of service and education for classification as Group 4.	Directors: Staff member employed full time in program or admn., who have a college degree or 120 semester hrs. of acceptable college work, or staff members similarly employed who have completed: (1) 6 yrs. of successful employment as Staff Associate (less one yr. for each year of college completed, (2) 3 units of YMCA Career Development Program sponsored by National Board of YMCA's, (3) a successful performance appraisal conducted by a member of General Agency staff (region/ Nat'l).	Technologist II: Bachelor's Degree	5 yrs. of progressive experience with Equivalency Examination.
Group 2: Instructors, Program Leaders, Administrative Assistants. May be full or part-time. Do not meet requirements for Secretaryship (i.e. Group 3 or 4).	Staff Associates: Staff members employed full time in program and administrative positions who do not meet the qualifications for listing as YMCA Directors, or who may be in the process of meeting these requirements.	Technologist I: 3rd yr. college certificate	4 yrs. of progressive experience with Equivalency Examination.
Group 1: Clerical, Maintenance, Food Service and similar employees, not related to conducting and supervising program. Do not meet requirements for Groups 2, 3, or 4.	General Employees: Related to essential operational functions, such as clerical, maintenance, food service, janitors, engineers	Technician II: Associate in Arts Degree Technician I: 1st year college certificate. Trainee: High School or less.	3 yrs. of progressive experience with Equivalency Examination. 2 yrs. of progressive experience with Equivalency Examination. 1 yr. of training before taking Qualifiying Examination for Technician I position.

Under both YMCA classification plans, Group 1 and General employees are clerical and food service personnel who are locked in dead-end jobs. Females are generally clerical and food service employees, and are restricted to these jobs under both systems. There is no system so far for better positions or testing for possible skill recognition.

Staff Associates under the present plans are still faced with problems of Group 2 employees under the former plan, being restricted to a formal educational system without alternative routes for acquiring skills, knowledge, and know-how.

Employees who are Directors are seemingly given a choice of routes to further advancement, but a close look shows that there is very little difference from them and the former Group 3. They are people with college degrees or a great number of credit hours. These position are virtually filled by degreed persons. After six years of successful employment, there is no system for skill recognition that would allow for immediate mobility for either non-degreed or degreed personnel.

Senior Directors (or under the former plan, Secretaries) are still the few executives who are given the greatest career benefits within the organization, allowing the "status system," which is based on academic achievement rather than life work experience and education, to continue to function.

Career Options proposes that the YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago utilize Pilot "C" on a limited scale for testing the reality of career advancement within and without the organization.